



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,318	08/31/2001	Wayne I Knigge	5328	1343

7590 05/19/2005

John A. O'Toole
General Mills, Inc.
Number One General Mills Blvd.
PO Box 1113
Minneapolis, MN 55440

EXAMINER

MADSEN, ROBERT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1761

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,318

Applicant(s)

KNIGGE ET AL.

Examiner

Robert Madsen

Art Unit

1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-17,21,22,24,27-29,32-35,37-39,41-43,45-57,59-65 and 77-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-17,21,22,24,27-29,32-35,37-39,41-43,45-57,59-65 and 77-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed January 26, 2005 has been entered. Claims 1,4-17,21,22,24,27-29,32-35,37-39,41-43,45-57,59-65,77-79
2. The objections to claims 35,37,38 and 45 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.
3. The rejections of claims 1,4-17,21,22,24,27-29,32-35,37-39,41-43,45-57,59-65 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement have been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 79 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear if the shelf life of the oat based cereal material is being doubled as compared to non-packaged or packaged oat based cereal material, and if packaged oat based cereal material is the comparison, the particular type of package (e.g. standard atmosphere packaging in cartons).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1,10,12, 15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259).

8. Beer teaches a bag capable of forming an air-tight vacuum- sealed rectangular bag that is made from a single laminated sheet and does not expose a product contained therein to the degradation effects of air (Column 1, lines 10-45 Column 2, lines 23-28, Figure 1) or light because it includes an oxygen barrier of foil, which would result in an opaque bag and a permeability of no greater than 0.013 cc/100 sqin per day as recited in claims 10,59-61. Consequently, less than 1ppm hexanal would be present as recited in claim 1, in the interior portion of the bag since oxygen and light cause oxidation/rancidity, and a vacuum-sealed opaque oxygen impermeable package would prevent oxygen or light from contact with the product. The bag also includes a moisture barrier(e.g. polyethylene) on the exterior of the oxygen barrier as recited in claim 65, a semi-rigid portion (i.e. gusseted) as recited in claim 27, an interior structure in the form of a rectangle as recited in claim 28, a reclosable seal (e.g. a pressure sensitive cold seal and a tin tie, clip or zipper) as recited in claims 41 and 42, and is suitable for preserving free flowing ready to eat breakfast cereal in a bag with structural integrity to withstand mishandling during shipping and yet the bag is easy to open (Abstract, ,

Art Unit: 1761

Column 2, lines 5-9 Column 3, lines 13-40, Column 4, lines 15-67, Column 5, line 7 to Column 6, line 3, Figures 5 and 6). However, Beer is silent in the particular type of free flowing ready to eat breakfast cereal, such as a frangible puffed cereal, that has a crush resistance no less than 7.0 PSIA, or 14.7 PSIA as recited in claim 15, the bag wherein vacuum sealing allows the package to be filled with approximately 20-60% more cereal, as recited in claim 1. Additionally, although Beer teach the bag has structural integrity to withstand mishandling during shipping, Beer is silent in teaching that it is sufficiently rigid to reduce breakage of the cereal therein per se as recited in claim 1.

9. With respect to puffed cereal and crush resistance, Thompson et al. '990 teach a crisp and friable (i.e. frangible), free-flowing, puffed ready to eat cereal that may be formed into any desired shape, such as a ring, and stays crisp in milk for a prolonged period of time. The product can have anywhere from 5-25% sugar, 1.5-5% fat, 3-5% moisture and can be made from a variety of flours (Column 1, lines 25-42, 60-70, Column 2, lines 35-40, Examples). Francis teaches crush resistance depends on flour quality (Figure 5), water activity (Figure 13 and Table 11), density (Figure 14) and water content (Figure 14). Therefore, it would have obvious to modify the ready to eat, free-flowing cereal Beer and include the free-flowing frangible puffed ready to eat cereal of Thompson et al. '990 because the free-flowing ready to eat cereal may be made into any desired form and stays crisp in milk for a prolonged period of time. To select such a cereal with a compression or crush resistance greater than 7.0 PSIA or 14.7 PSI, would have been an obvious result effective variable of the particular moisture level, water

Art Unit: 1761

activity, and type of flour selected since Thompson et al. teach (1) crisp and friable but can maintain crispness in milk for a prolonged period of time and (2) selecting a variety of fat, sugar, and moisture levels (which affect moisture content and water activity) and various types of flours, which, in light of Francis, will affect the crush or compression resistance.

10. With respect to a vacuum bag providing sufficient rigidity to reduce breakage of the cereal and vacuum sealing allowing 20-60% more cereal, Magleic et al. teach settling product in a bag prior to vacuum sealing will provide sufficient rigidity to reduce breakage as compared to conventional sealing and allow, in the case of French fries, 30% more product (i.e. reduce the packaging volume required by 30%). Magleic et al. teach a vacuum will retain the product in a tight alignment with maximum bulk density (Column 1, lines 10-40, Column 5, lines 20-48, Column 6, lines 52-65). McCrosson is relied on further evidence that drawing sufficient air from a bag during vacuum sealing so that the bag walls will be drawn in tightly toward the material and conform around the material held within the bag. McCrosson teaches that even with a bag made of thin material will provide a sufficiently rigid bag structure about a crushable item (e.g. cigar) to reduce breakage during shipping (Page 1, lines 32-51, Page 2, lines 31 to 65, Figure 1). Ylvisaker et al. teach the degree to which a product settles in bag by conventional filling (or the bulk density) is a function of the geometry of the particular product (Column 1, lines 15-42).

11. Therefore, to modify Beer and provide a rigid structure to reduce breakage during shipping would have been obvious depending on (1) the degree of settling prior to

Art Unit: 1761

drawing the vacuum, (2) the resulting bulk density after settling, and (3) the degree of vacuum applied, since Maglecic et al. teach a vacuum bag will provide a rigid structure that will reduce breakage when the food product is first settled to maximize the bulk density, Ylvisaker et al. teach the degree to which settling is possible depends on the geometry of the material, Maglecic et al. teach withdrawing a sufficient amount of air from a material with maximized bulk density will maintain the product in a tight alignment, and McCrosson teaches a vacuum bag made of even thin material is capable of tightly conforming around a packaged good to provide a rigid structure to prevent breakage. To increase the amount of the material by 20-60% that would occupy the bag under vacuum conditions as opposed to non-vacuum conditions would have been an obvious depending on the particular shape of the cereal since Maglecic et al. teach by settling French fries (or maximizing the bulk density) prior to vacuum sealing one can increase the filling capacity and Ylvisaker et al. teach the bulk density of a product is dependent on its shape. Thus, uniform shapes (e.g. spheres) would allow for a greater filling capacity than irregular shapes (e.g. stars) under vacuum packaging conditions.

12. Regarding claim 12, although Beer is silent in teaching the exterior portion of the bag is textured, as discussed above McCrosson teaches that drawing sufficient air from a bag during vacuum sealing will cause the walls be drawn in tightly toward the material and conform around the material held within the bag, resulting in a sufficiently rigid structure to protect the material (Page 1, lines 32-51, Page 2, lines 31 to 65, Figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a texture on the exterior portion of the

Art Unit: 1761

bag, since McCrosson teaches by drawing sufficient vacuum, the bag will collapse around the material and one will obtain a sufficiently rigid structure to protect the material held within the bag.

13. Regarding claim 29, Beer teaches a vacuum-sealed oxygen impermeable opaque bag containing flowable foodstuffs, such as ready to eat cereals, but is silent in teaching a particular gas or that the flowable foodstuffs include snack chips. As discussed above, in the rejection of claim 1, Thompson et al. '990 teach a crisp and friable (i.e. frangible), free flowing, puffed ready to eat cereal that may be formed into *any* desired shape. Therefore, to further include a puffed-cereal based snack chip would have been obvious, depending on the particular size of puffed cereal based material selected, since a puffed cereal based material produced for breakfast cereals would certainly be consumable as a snack without milk and could be of any desired shape.

14. Claims 4 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12, 15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Ray (US 370419) .

15. Beer is silent in teaching an exterior carton of paperboard. Ray, however, is relied on as evidence of the conventionality of placing a vacuum-sealed bag of cereal in an exterior carton, if desired (See Column 1, lines1-35, Column 1 line 49 to column 2,

Art Unit: 1761

line2, Column 3, lines 1-56, Column 4, lines 59-63, and Column 10-23). Therefore, to place the bag of Beer into an exterior carton would have been obvious, depending on the desired type of exterior packaging appearance since Ray teaches vacuum-sealed cereal containing bags may be stored in cartons if desired and it may be desirable to place the vacuum bag of Beer in a carton so that it would have a better physical fit on a store shelf comprising other cereal cartons. It would have been further obvious to select a paperboard carton, since this is a conventionally well-known carton material for breakfast cereals.

16. Claims 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259), further in view of Ray (US 370419), as applied to claims 4 and 48 above, further in view of Ours et al. (US 6062467).

17. Modified Beer is silent in teaching a perforated area for opening the bag and a paperboard carton. However, Ours et al, who also teach a rectangular reclosable bag, made from a laminated sheet with an oxygen barrier, a moisture barrier held within a paperboard carton, teaches providing a perforated area in the bag for the convenience of opening and dispensing the breakfast cereal, as well as re-closing (Column 1, lines 15-31, Column 2, lines 60-64, Column 3, lines 30-40, Column 4, lines 20-28, Column 5, line 38 to column 6, line 48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify Beer since Ours et al. teach providing a perforated area in the bag near

Art Unit: 1761

the top when the bag is inside a paperboard carton would provide a convenient and reclosable way of dispensing the breakfast cereal.

18. Claims 5-8,13,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12,15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Witkowski (US 6594927 B2).

19. Modified Beer is silent in teaching any particular location of premiums or coupons for the packaged cereal bar. Witkowski teaches it notoriously well known and desirable to provide premiums and/or coupons with cereal based products that are packaged in boxes, but that food manufactures have found it difficult to provide such items for products packaged in bags/wrappers with affixing including pressure sensitive labels, preprinted information, on the inside or outside of the package, with a separate compartment as recited in claims 5-8,13-14 (Column 1, lines 16-55, Column 2, line 59 to Column 3, line 10). Witkowski teaches how to provide such features for bag and wrappers in an efficient manner (Column 3, lines 14-42, Column 3, line 54 to Column 4, line 25, Column 4, lines 40-50, Column 7, lines 22 to Column 8, line 40, Column 10, lines 59 to Column 11, line 16) Note the "separate" compartment is understood to be hidden windows within multiple layers of a pouch (Column 17, line 64 to Column 18, line 6).

20. Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify the bags of Beer and include premiums or coupons by affixing including pressure sensitive labels, preprinted

Art Unit: 1761

information, on the inside or outside of the package, or with a separate compartment as recited in claims 5-8,13-14, since Witkowski teaches it notoriously well known and desirable to provide premiums and/or coupons with cereal based products that are packaged in boxes and teaches how providing such features in a much more efficient way so that products packaged in bags/wrappers may offer the desirable premiums and coupons.

33-35 & 37-38

21. Claims 9,11, ~~33-38~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12,15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Galomb (US 6245367 B1).

22. Regarding claims 9 and 11, modified Beer is silent in teaching a translucent bag or transparent window. Galomb also teaches breakfast cereal bags with barrier layers and metal foil layers like Beer. However, Galomb further teaches if desired one may provide translucent walls or even a transparent window to view the product (Abstract, Column 4, lines 15-34). Therefore, it would have been an obvious to modify the walls of Beer to provide a translucent bag or window , depending on if it was desirable for a consumer to view the packaged product since Galomb teaches providing translucent walls or even a transparent window for a cereal bag may be done if desired for viewing the product.

Art Unit: 1761

23. Regarding claims 33-38, modified Beer is silent in teaching the breakfast cereal bag has two compartments, two different products (one particulate, one non-particulate), or the specific water activity, as recited in claims 33-38. Galomb teaches packaging two different products including, breakfast cereals, in a two compartment bag, with two different products, wherein the water activity is at least about 0.1 for a nonparticulate portion (other foods could be dry such as sugar or gellable products) and 0.2-0.4 for the particulate cereal (i.e. desired cereal crispness for either flake or pellets, as evidenced by Francis (Column 2, Paragraph 2, Page 2622, table 13(a)) would have a water activity in this range) for the convenience of eating together (Abstract, Column 8, lines 32-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Beer and include a non-particulate product with a water activity of at least 0.1 and the cereal with a water activity of 0.2-0.4 since it would provide the convenience of having a package holding two items that are stored separately but are eaten together. To include a raisin with a water activity of 0.6 would have been obvious, depending on the desired item for eating together with the cereal, since Galomb teaches providing non-particulate items that would be desirable to consume with a breakfast cereal and it was notoriously well known to consume raisins with a breakfast cereal.

24. Claims 16,17,21,22, 43,45-47,51-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585)

Art Unit: 1761

and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12, 15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Thompson et al. (US 2478438).

25. Regarding claims 16, 17, 21, 22, and 43, modified Beer includes ring shaped pieces, as recited in claim 21, but is silent in teaching the ready to eat cereal comprises whole grain rice or oat, as recited in claims 16 and 43, or soy flour as recited in claim 17, or includes irregular shapes as recited in claim 22. Thompson et al. '438 teach it is desirable to combine a variety of cereals, including whole rice grain as recited in claims 16 and 43, with soybeans, which would comprise soy flour as recited in claim 17, to complement their nutritional properties and modify their deficiencies or excesses and are less costly ingredients than conventional refined flours, wherein the formulation may be formed in either a particular shape such as a ring or an irregular shape (i.e. a flake), as recited in claim 17 (Column 1, lines 1-14, 38-47, Column 3, lines 38-65, Column 5, lines 3-46, Examples). Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify Beer and include whole grains, such as oat or rice and soy flour, since Thompson et al. '438 teach using the grains and soybeans in combination will provide an improved nutritional formula, and by using whole grains, the cost of ingredients is lower. It would have been further obvious to select an irregular shape, depending on the desired form of puffed cereal, since Thompson et al. '438 teach puffed cereals can be made into either a regular shape, such as a ring, or an irregular shape, such as a flake.

26. Regarding claims 45-47, 51-57, modified Beer teaches a seal strong enough to maintain vacuum conditions such as a pressure sensitive cold seal and a tin tie, clip or zipper, a brick/rectangular shaped bag with a bottom, opening at the top, and sides

Art Unit: 1761

(Abstract, Column 1, lines 38-45, Column 2, lines 5-9 Column 3, lines 13-40, Column 4, lines 15-67, Column 5, line 7 to Column 6, line 3, Figures 5 and 6).

27. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12,15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Schwab et al. (US 342635).

28. Beer is silent in teaching marbits. Schwab et al. teach it is well known to include marbits with cereal packages for a pleasing variety (Column 1, lines 5-34). Therefore, it would have been obvious to further include marbits with the cereal of Beer since it was known that this is a pleasing variety of cereal.

29. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12, 15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Kraft Foods Inc. (WO9812110).

30. Beer teaches gas flushing (Column 1, lines 35-45) a vacuum-sealed oxygen impermeable opaque bag containing flowable foodstuffs, such as ready to eat cereals, but is silent in teaching a particular gas.

Art Unit: 1761

31. Kraft Foods Inc. also teaches a rectangular reclosable vacuum sealed oxygen impermeable, opaque bag for free flowing food items and uses a Nitrogen flush to protect the cereal products (e.g. rice flakes) against oxidation, (Abstract Page 1,5,6,11,12, 17,20,37,43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify Beer and flush the bag with Nitrogen, since Beer teaches preventing the degradation effects of air by gas flushing vacuum sealed bags and Kraft Foods Inc. teach a Nitrogen flush will protect cereal products against oxidation when the cereal products held in vacuum sealed bags.

32. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12,15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of further in view of Hellweg et al. (US 5523109).

33. As discussed above in the rejection of claim 1, Beer teaches an air-tight vacuum sealed bag holding a free-flowing ready to eat cereal and Thompson et al. '990 teach a free-flowing ready to eat cereal that are puffed, crisp and friable (i.e. frangible) that may be formed from a variety of flours, such as oat flour(Column 1, lines 25-42, 60-70, Column 2, lines 35-40, Examples). Hellweg et al. teach treating oat flour to inactivate enzymes, and thus prevent rancidity, in puffed oat flour based products (Abstract, Column 3, lines 35-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Beer and select a puffed oat flour-based cereal product, depending on the desired type of flavor

Art Unit: 1761

or nutrients desired since Beer teaches a free-flowing breakfast cereal and Thompson et al. teach free-flowing breakfast cereals can be made from a variety of flours, which would vary in flavors and nutrients. It would have been further obvious to treat oat flour to prevent rancidity since Hellweg teaches inactivating enzymes in oat flour to prevent rancidity when oat flour is used for puffed cereal based products.

34. Claims 62-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claims 1,10,12,15,27-29,41,42,59-61,65 above, further in view of Miyake et al. (US 5942320).

35. Beer teaches an oxygen barrier layer and a moisture barrier layer with polyethylene and aluminum foil, but is silent in teaching a *metallized* polymeric composite and PP, PE, PET or PLA as recited in claim 62, oxygen scavengers or antioxidants as recited in claim 63, or layers of aluminum oxide coated polyethylene, polyester, glass or ceramic, and a polyester seal interior of the aluminum oxide coated polyethylene layer as recited in claim 64. Miyake et al. teach barrier composite films for dry foods that have mechanical strength and are good for preservation that include oxygen and moisture barriers, including polyethylene and metallized polymeric layer as moisture barriers. Miyake et al. teach layers of aluminum oxide coated polyethylene, polyester, glass or ceramic, and a polyester seal interior of the aluminum oxide coated polyethylene layer (Column 1, lines 5-13Column 3, lines 12-22Column 4, line 40 to

Art Unit: 1761

Column 5, line 2, Column 5, lines 33-42 Column 10, line 33 to Column 11, line 25, Column 15, lines 49-63, Column 17, lines 25-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a metallized polymeric layer as the moisture barrier and a substrate of polyethylene, in addition to an oxygen barrier, antioxidants, as recited in claim 63, or even layers of aluminum oxide coated polyethylene, polyester, glass or ceramic, and a polyester seal interior of the aluminum oxide coated polyethylene layer since Miyake et al. teaches these oxygen /moisture barriers film-based food packages will have sufficient mechanical strength and provide good preservation for dry foods.

36. Claim 77 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259).

37. Beer teaches a bag capable of forming an air-tight vacuum- sealed rectangular bag that is made from a single laminated sheet and does not expose a product contained therein to the degradation effects of air (Column 1, lines 10-45 Column 2, lines 23-28, Figure 1) or light because it includes an oxygen barrier foil layer (i.e. the sheet is not oxygen permeable and opaque). Consequently, less than 1ppm hexanal would be present in interior portion of the bag since oxygen and light cause oxidation/rancidity, and a vacuum-sealed opaque oxygen impermeable package would prevent oxygen or light from contact with the product. The laminate further includes a moisture barrier. The bag is suitable for preserving free flowing ready to eat breakfast cereal in a bag with structural integrity to withstand mishandling during shipping and

Art Unit: 1761

yet the bag is easy to open. (Abstract, , Column 2, lines 5-9 Column 3, lines 13-40, Column 4, lines 15-67, Column 5, line 7 to Column 6, line 3, Figures 5 and 6). However, Beer is silent in the particular type of free flowing ready to eat breakfast cereal, such as a frangible puffed oat cereal that has a crush resistance no less than 7.0 PSIA, and that the vacuum sealing allows the package to be filled with approximately 20-60% more cereal . Additionally, although Beer teach the bag has structural integrity to withstand mishandling during shipping, Beer is silent in teaching that it is sufficiently rigid to reduce breakage of the cereal therein per se.

38. With respect to puffed cereal and crush resistance, Thompson et al. '990 teach a crisp and friable (i.e. frangible), free-flowing, puffed ready to eat cereal that may be formed into any desired shape, such as a ring, and stays crisp in milk for a prolonged period of time. The product can have anywhere from 5-25% sugar, 1.5-5% fat, 3-5% moisture and can be made from a variety of flours (Column 1, lines 25-42, 60-70, Column 2, lines 35-40, Examples). Francis teaches crush resistance depends on flour quality (Figure 5), water activity (Figure 13 and Table 11), density (Figure 14) and water content (Figure 14). Therefore, it would have obvious to modify the ready to eat, free-flowing cereal Beer and include the free-flowing frangible puffed ready to eat cereal of Thompson et al. '990 because the free-flowing ready to eat cereal may be made into any desired form and stays crisp in milk for a prolonged period of time. To select such a cereal with a compression or crush resistance greater than 7.0 PSIA or 14.7 PSI, would have been an obvious result effective variable of the particular moisture level, water activity, and type of flour selected since Thompson et al. teach (1) crisp and friable but

Art Unit: 1761

can maintain crispness in milk for a prolonged period of time and (2) selecting a variety of fat, sugar, and moisture levels (which affect moisture content and water activity) and various types of flours, which, in light of Francis, will affect the crush or compression resistance.

39. With respect to a vacuum bag providing sufficient rigidity to reduce breakage of the cereal and vacuum sealing allowing 20-60% more cereal, Maglecic et al. teach settling product in a bag prior to vacuum sealing will provide sufficient rigidity to reduce breakage as compared to conventional sealing and allow, in the case of French fries, 30% more product (i.e. reduce the packaging volume required by 30%). Maglecic et al. teach a vacuum will retain the product in a tight alignment with maximum bulk density (Column 1, lines 10-40, Column 5, lines 20-48, Column 6, lines 52-65). McCrosson is relied on further evidence that drawing sufficient air from a bag during vacuum sealing so that the bag walls will be drawn in tightly toward the material and conform around the material held within the bag. McCrosson teaches that even with a bag made of thin material will provide a sufficiently rigid bag structure about a crushable item (e.g. cigar) to reduce breakage during shipping (Page 1, lines 32-51, Page 2, lines 31 to 65, Figure 1). Ylvisaker et al. teach the degree to which a product settles in bag by conventional filling (or the bulk density) is a function of the geometry of the particular product (Column 1, lines 15-42).

40. Therefore, to modify Beer and provide a rigid structure to reduce breakage during shipping would have been obvious depending on (1) the degree of settling prior to drawing the vacuum, (2) the resulting bulk density after settling, and (3) the degree of

Art Unit: 1761

vacuum applied, since Maglecic et al. teach a vacuum bag will provide a rigid structure that will reduce breakage when the food product is first settled to maximize the bulk density, Ylvisaker et al. teach the degree to which settling is possible depends on the geometry of the material, Maglecic et al. teach withdrawing a sufficient amount of air from a material with maximized bulk density will maintain the product in a tight alignment, and McCrosson teaches a vacuum bag made of even thin material is capable of tightly conforming around a packaged good to provide a rigid structure to prevent breakage. To increase the amount of the material by 20-60% that would occupy the bag under vacuum conditions as opposed to non-vacuum conditions would have been an obvious depending on the particular shape of the cereal since Maglecic et al. teach by settling French fries (or maximizing the bulk density) prior to vacuum sealing one can increase the filling capacity and Ylvisaker et al. teach the bulk density of a product is dependent on its shape. Thus, uniform shapes (e.g. spheres) would allow for a greater filling capacity than irregular shapes (e.g. stars) under vacuum packaging conditions.

41. Claims 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beer (US 6213645 B1) in view of Thompson et al. (US 3246990) and Francis and Maglecic et al. (US 5473866) and McCrosson (US 145585) and Ylvisaker et al. (US 4964259) as applied to claim 77 above, further in view of Hellweg et al. (US 5523109).

42. Although Beer teaches a vacuum sealed, oxygen impermeable, and opaque bag (features which prevent oxidation and rancidity), Beer is silent in teaching that the

Art Unit: 1761

rancidity is substantially eliminated from the oat cereal material itself, as recited in claim 78 or that the shelf life is doubled as recited in claim 79.

43. Hellweg et al. teach treating oat flour to inactivate enzymes, and thus prevent rancidity in puffed oat flour based products (Abstract, Column 3, lines 35-53).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify Beer and treat oat flour to prevent rancidity, as recited in claim 78, since Beer's bag will prevent the cereal based material's exposure to oxygen and light during the shelf life, but it does not take into account eliminating the effects of oxygen and light prior to packaging (e.g. during conventional cereal processing steps, such as puffing), and Hellweg teaches inactivating enzymes in oat flour to prevent rancidity when oat flour is used for puffed cereal based products. To obtain nearly double the shelf life, would have been obvious, depending on the basis of comparison, since the combination of (1) an oxygen free/light free package and (2) pre-treatment of the flour prior to the puffed cereal production process would increase the shelf life of the puffed cereal most significantly when compared to non-treated flour cereal that is not packed, but less a non-treated flour based cereal stored in a transparent gas flushed bag held in a carton.

Response to Arguments

44. Applicant's arguments with respect to Sirohi et al. have been fully considered. The amended claim language recites the "vacuum sealing allows the package to be filled with approximately 20-60% more cereal based material". Sirohi is drawn to a cereal-based bar and this new limitation implies the cereal based material's bulk density

Art Unit: 1761

is compressed by the vacuum. The references of record do not teach if it would be desirable to "compress" a food bar. For this reason, the rejections of Claims 1, 9,10,12,15,16,41,43,59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirohi et al. (US 6773734 B2) in view of Francis and Lusas et al. (US 5296253), Claims 5-8,13-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirohi et al. (US 6773734 B2) in view of Francis and Lucas et al. (US 5296253) further in view of Witkowski (US 6594927 B2), and Claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sirohi et al. (US 6773734 B2) in view of Francis and Lucas et al. (US 5296253) further in view of Hellweg et al. (US 5523109) have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection were made as set forth above.

45. In light of the amendment, the rejections based on Gausman do not address the (1) "vacuum sealing allows the package to be filled with approximately 20-60% more cereal based material" or (2) sufficiently rigid to reduce breakage of the cereal based material. For these reasons, the rejection of Claims 1,10,16,,22,27-32, 43,46,47,51-54,59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gausman (US 2956383) in view of Francis and Kraft Foods Inc. (WO9812110) is withdrawn.

46. Applicant's arguments with respect to Ringe have been considered, but are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Ringe (US 5024996) is a 102(e) reference and was co-owned with the present application at the time the invention was made. However, the effective filing date of the present application is 2001, and the patent date of Ringe is 1991. Thus, Ringe qualifies as prior art under 102(b), not 102(e), and the rejection

Art Unit: 1761

cannot be overcome by evidence of common ownership. See MPEP 706.02(I)(3) in light of 706.02(a).

47. In light of the amendment, the rejections based on Ringe do not address the (1) "vacuum sealing allows the package to be filled with approximately 20-60% more cereal based material" or (2) sufficiently rigid to reduce breakage of the cereal based material. For these reasons, the rejections of Claims 1, 10, 13, 15, 16, 27, 28, 41-43, 46, 47, 51-61, 65 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), Claims 9, 11, 33, 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1) further in view of Galomb (US 6245367 B1), Claims 4 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Ray (US 370419), Claims 49 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Ray (US 370419) and Ours et al. (US 6062467), Claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Bendenk et al. (US 3753728), Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Schwab et al. (US 342635), Claims 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Bendenk et al. (US 3708308), and Claims 62-64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

Art Unit: 1761

unpatentable over Ringe (US 5024996) in view of Francis and Beer (US 6213645 B1), further in view of Miyake et al. (US 5942320) have been withdrawn.

Conclusion

48. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

49. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

50. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

51. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1761

52. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Madsen
Examiner
Art Unit 1761



RAM



MILTON I. CANO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700